

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the quick and courteous non-final Action. The Applicants are particularly appreciative of the allowance of claims 15-21.

Claims 1-3, 5-12 and 15-21 are present in the application.

Claims 1-13 were rejected.

Claims 4 and 13-14 have been canceled.

Rejection of Replacement Sheet and Specification Amendment as New Matter

The Examiner has rejected the Applicants' addition of reference numeral 60 in page 3, lines 33-35 and the single drawing replacement sheet submitted March 8, 2011 as improper insertions of new matter.

The Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the fact that reference numeral 60 has been deleted herewith from page 3, lines 33-35. Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully withdraw the drawing replacement sheet submitted on March 8, 2011. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection with respect to this material and drawing is thus overcome and is rendered moot. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because although all of the independent claims 1, 15 and 19 recite "the discharge chamber containing [or contains] a second filter media which is of a larger average particle size than the rest of the filter media in the housing", this feature is not shown in the drawings. The Examiner helpfully indicated that this feature is not shown or suggested by the references of record.

The Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the enclosed Replacement Sheet 2/6. The Applicants respectfully request that it be entered. It contains a new circle on Fig. 3 denoted "Fig. 8 detail" and a new Fig. 8 showing the detail of the new circle in Fig. 3. In Fig. 8, second filter media 11 in second-

ary central screen 10 is shown as having a larger average size than filter media 9. This replacement sheet was requested by the Examiner. The addition of Fig. 8 does not constitute improper insertion of new matter since these features were described in the application as filed.

Further, a paragraph has been added herein to the end of the Brief Description of the Drawings on page 7 briefly describing new Fig. 8. Additionally, Fig. 8 is briefly described in a new paragraph at the end of the specification on page 10.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of Fig. 8 and the accompanying portions of the specification overcome the Examiner's objection to the drawings. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

There being no art rejections, the Applicants are hopeful that with the resolution of the above-noted issues, the claims are allowable. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, the Examiner kindly noted that the Applicants are entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments and arguments presented above place the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully reminded of his continuing duty to indicate allowable subject matter. The Examiner is also invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number below for any reason, especially any reason that may help advance the prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVID JOHN PARKINSON, et al.,

/David L. Mossman/

David L. Mossman
Registration No. 29,570
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone No. 512/219-4026
Facsimile No. 512/219-4036